

access to the associated process of the workflow system, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 10.

The thrust of the Office Action's assertion is that Sakaguchi discloses an email based workflow design in which email is created. Paul discloses embedding a hyperlink in an email. Thus, the combination of Sakaguchi and Paul would render obvious to one skilled in the art the features of claims 1 and 10. See page 3 of the Office Action.

On the contrary, the Office Action does not articulate which portions of Sakaguchi or Paul provides for the teaching, suggestion or the motivation to create an e-mail message to the recipient by the user, the recipient who does not have access to the workflow system and the link provides the recipient with an access to the associated process of the workflow system.

As discussed in the previous response, Sakaguchi's Fig. 5 shows that all the users and recipients of the email have access to the workflow system. The Office Action has not referred to a figure or passage in the Sakaguchi that discloses an entity that does not have access to Sakaguchi's workflow system. Because Sakaguchi does not contemplate a situation where a recipient does not have access to the workflow system, it follows that Sakaguchi does not disclose, suggest or provide motivation to allow an entity who does not have access to the workflow system to have access to the workflow system.

Paul, on the other hand, merely discloses that a hyperlink can be embedded in an email. Paul, however, does not disclose, suggest or provide motivation to create a hyperlink that specifically provides a recipient with an access to the associated process of the workflow system. Paul does not disclose, suggest or provide the motivation because Paul does not contemplate creating a hyperlink in a workflow system.

As discussed above, neither references, individually or combined, provide the teaching, suggestion or the motivation to create an e-mail message to the recipient by the user,

the recipient who does not have access to the workflow system, and the link provides the recipient with an access to the associated process of the workflow system.

Yet, the Office Action, in a conclusory manner, asserts that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a link in an email allows an email recipient to access data, even data that may not have been accessible otherwise. See page 3 of the Office Action. Such conclusion could not have been derived from the disclosures of the references, but rather from the teachings of the application, which is impermissible hindsight.

Independent claims 21 and 23 are also allowable for similar reasons.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 10, 21 and 23 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-9, 11-20, 22 and 24-25 depend on the respective independent claims, and therefore also define patentable subject matter, as well as for the other features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Yong S. Choi  
Registration No. 43,324

JAO:YSC/tls

Date: September 29, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--